

GOVERNMENT OF ANDHRA PRADESH

ABSTRACT

Public Services – Agriculture Department – Disciplinary action initiated against Sri P. Chiranjeevi Rao, former AEO, Vangara (now retired) under Rule 20 of Andhra Pradesh Civil Service (CC&A) Rules, 1991 – Inquiry conducted – Final orders – Issued.

AGICULTURE & COOPERATION (VIG.I) DEPARTMENT.

G.O.Rt. No.823

Dated. 01-07-2008.

Read the following:-

1. G.O.Rt.No.106, Agri. & Coop. (Vig.I) Dept., Dt. 10-2-2003.
2. From Sri P. Chiranjeevi Rao, former AEO, Vangara (now retired) written statement of defence, dt. 13-3-2003.
3. Govt. Memo No.1206/Vig.I/1/2003-1, Dt. 17-6-2003.
4. Govt. Memo No. 1206/Vig.I/1/2003-2, Dt. 17-6-2003.
5. From the JDA, Srikakulam & I.O. letter Rc.No.Esst.(1)401/ 2003, Dt. 28-2-2004.
6. Govt. Memo No. 1206/Vig.I/1/2003-10, A&C (Vig.I) Dept., Dt. 23-9-2006.
7. From Sri P. Chiranjeevi Rao, former AEO, Vangara (now retired) Representation dated 10-11-2006.

-o0o-

ORDER:

Government have initiated disciplinary action against Sri P. Chiranjeevi Rao, former AEO, Vangara (now retired) under Rule 20 of the A.P.C.S. (CC&A) Rules, 1991 for making irregular recommendations for payment of Rs.3,23,405/- to ineligible farmers towards compensation to the horticultural crops damaged due to cyclone occurred on 17th and 18th October, 1999 in Silagam Village of Kaviti Mandal, Srikakulam District and framed the following articles of charge:-

Articles of Charge: That the said Sri P. Chiranjeevi Rao, former AEO, Vangara (now retired) has recommended for payment of compensation to a tune of Rs.3,23,405/- for damages to the Horticulture crops due to cyclone occurred on 17-10-1999 and 18-10-1999 in Silagam village of Kaviti Mandal to 26 bogus cases, Landless persons, two times for the same land, compensation in excess of the land against the actual extent possessed by ryots and ghost cases without noting the Survey Nos. of the land in the proposals for payment of compensation and thus he violated Rule 3 of APCS (Conduct) Rules, 1964

2. The Charged Officer in his written statement of defence denied the charge and requested to accept his explanation and exonerate him from the above charge. Government decided to conduct regular inquiry into the charge and in the regular inquiry the inquiry officer held the charge not proved against the charged officer. Government had examined the inquiry report and decided to disagree with the findings of the Inquiry Officer. Accordingly a copy of the Inquiry Report along with disagreement factors was communicated to the Charged Officer for his representation, if any, in the matter. The Charged Officer in his representation has stated that the damage of crops had to be assessed by the Technocrats, beneficiaries of land owners had to be decided according to land records maintained by the Revenue Department officials at the village level by the Village Officer; thus the work depends on two persons ie., Technocrats and Administration Officials; and in such a case holding only technocrats responsible for non-technical matters ie., identification of land owners with Survey Nos. by leaving administration officials is unjust and unfair; that if any lapse in technical work ie., identification of health crop was found, the technocrats were responsible, hence there was no technical irregularity found while assessing the Horticulture crop damage. He has further stated that the V.A.O had assisted him in identification of farmers and noting the survey numbers etc., The Charged Officer,

PTO

has further stated that the enumerated lists were scrutinized by the Revenue and Horticulture Department Officials and compensation amount were paid by them. He has, therefore, requested the Government to drop further action and to exonerate him from the charge.

3. Government have carefully examined the matter and observes that in fact the contention of the C.O. that they were totally led astray by the village officer itself, in a way, amounts to admission of the irregularities committed by the Charged Officer. Even assuming for a moment the absence of any malafide intention, the C.O. could not be absolved of the guilt of careless and negligent enumeration and become liable for imposition of a minor penalty of 'Censure'. But as the officer is retired from service and the penalty to be imposed against him is under Rule 9 (2) of the A.P. Revised Pension Rules, 1980 and as there is no corresponding penalty under the above rules to that of 'Censure, Government consider not to impose any penalty under the said A.P. Revised Pension Rules, 1980.

4. The disciplinary case against Sri P. Chiranjeevi Rao, former AEO, Vangara (now retired) is accordingly disposed of.

5. The Commissioner and Director of Agriculture, A.P., Hyderabad is requested to release pension and gratuity due to the officer as expeditiously on possible.

(BY ORDER AND IN THE NAME OF THE GOVERNOR OF ANDHRA PRADESH)

**C.R. BISWAL
PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT**

To
Sri P.Chiranjeevi Rao, former AEO, Vangara (Now retired)
through the C&DA, Hyderabad.

Copy to :
The Commissioner and Director of Agriculture, A.P., Hyderabad.
The Secretary, APVC, Hyderabad.
Sf/Sc.

// FORWARDED BY ORDER //

SECTION OFFICER